

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vriginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/693,120	10/20/2000		Dosuk D. Lee	04712/027002	7808	
21559	7590	11/26/2003		EXAMINER		
~	ELBING LLI AL STREET	•	SHARAREH, SHAHNAM J			
BOSTON, N				ART UNIT PAPER NUM		
				1617		
				DATE MAILED: 11/26/200	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<del></del> _
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/693,120	LEE ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Shahnam Sharareh	1617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to aviginal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate or the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): rejections over 35 USC 1	12 1st and 2nd para.	<b>_</b> ∙
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 22-44.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. ☐ Other:		RUSSELL TRAVE PRIMARY EXAMIN GROUP 1200	-

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Applicant's arguments against individual references are not found persusive because the rejection is based on their combined teachings. Specifically, Yamamura teaches calcium phosphate compsotions as drug delivery. Gerhart provides for injectable paste consistency see abstract; col 7, lines 30-46, 60-67; col 8, lines 1-20; examples 2-3. Constantz teaches methods of preparing a kit. Accordingly, the combined teachings of the references meet all the elements of the instant claims. Claims stand rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over Applicantion SN 09/692,664 for the reasons of record.

\_